



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,302	01/14/2002	Ferhan Elvanoglu	2890	5174

7590 03/28/2007  
MICHALIK & WYLIE, PLLC  
Suite 193  
704 -228th Avenue NE  
Sammamish, WA 98074

EXAMINER
----------

CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/047,302

Applicant(s)

ELVANOGLU ET AL.

Examiner

David G. Cervetti

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57 and 60-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57 and 60-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 26, 2006 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
2. Claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57, and 60-63 are pending and have been examined. Claims 19-25, 31, 49-54, and 58-59 have been canceled.

### *Response to Amendment*

3. The objections to the specification are withdrawn.
4. The objection to claim 48 is withdrawn.
5. Regarding the Double Patenting rejection, the instant application's claims have not been patented, this is why it is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. The fact that the documents are received from a known source, does not imply in any way that the documents are trusted, and for security reasons, applying access policies to data received from the database as taught by Fletcher is analogous to applying access policies (security zones, etc) to data accessed through the web. Fletcher is not limiting to where the data comes from, but how the access to the data is controlled, **Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.**
6. Examiner is not clear as to Applicant's arguments, since it appears to be a conflict between the arguments against the Double Patenting and the arguments against the 35 USC 102 rejection. The conflict is as follows, regarding the double patenting, Applicant states that the documents are retrieved from a known source and provide security based on who accesses it (page 11), while the arguments against the 35 USC 102 rejection state that Fletcher is silent with respect to the source of the

Art Unit: 2136

content. Examiner submits Fletcher teaches this feature since the markup language syntax is encoded in the markup language and indicates a security level of the delimited security-sensitive section (Fletcher, claim 1). According to this interpretation, the database is the source. **Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.**

7. Regarding claims 26-30 and 32-48, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., protecting a computer from malicious code) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

8. Examiner would further like to point that inheritance of behavior and overwriting behavior that may be inherited was conventional and well known as shown by Bloch (US Patent 6,820,261, col. 6, lines 22-50 and claim 1) as it applies to the programming language Java; and providing such functionality to other languages (programming or markup languages) would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art. **Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.**

9. ***The applicant has not traversed the examiner's use of official notice with regards to the claimed limitations found in claims 3 and 42, these features are taken by the examiner to be admitted prior art since the applicant has not adequately challenged the examiner's use of official notice (see MPEP 2144.03(c), 2144.04).***

Art Unit: 2136

10. Examiner further submits that adding an attribute to the already defined HTML set of tags and attributes to fit some specific purpose would have been obvious, in other words extending the functionality of the language (NPL "XML and security") would have been analogous to adding an extra letter to the English alphabet.

***Double Patenting***

11. Claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57, and 60-63 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,912 to Wallent et al. in view of Fletcher et al. (US Patent 7,010,681, hereinafter Fletcher).

12. Wallent et al. teach the use of security zones with a browser and markup language elements (columns 11-12, claims 1-19), Fletcher teaches using security attributes with markup language elements (summary, columns 3-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Fletcher to the system of Wallent et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to further protect the system of Wallent from downloaded content (Fletcher, columns 1-2).

13. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is claimed in the referenced patent.

14. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

16. **Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12, 17-18, 55-56, and 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fletcher.**

**Regarding claim 1**, Fletcher teaches in a computer system, a method comprising:

- receiving a page comprising content including one or more elements having active content; and
- controlling page output and any actions corresponding to at least part of the content by:
  - o 1) interpreting at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings, the first set of security settings being based on an identifier indicating a source from which the page is obtained (column 5, lines 1-50); and
  - o 2) interpreting at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security settings associated with an element of the page, the

second set of security settings being different from the first set (column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 55**, Fletcher teaches a markup language document, comprising:

- a first set of content associated with a first set of security settings, the first set of security settings being based on an identifier indicating a source on a network or a local computer from which the first set of content is obtained (column 5, lines 1-50); and
- a second set of content associated with a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings (column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 2**, Fletcher teaches wherein receiving the page includes accessing data received from a remote source (column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 3**, Fletcher teaches wherein receiving the page includes accessing data received from a cache (column 5, lines 1-27). Furthermore, this feature has been admitted per applicant to have been conventional and well known to access data received from a cache at the time the invention was made.

**Regarding claim 4**, Fletcher teaches wherein a first action is requested in the content in the at least one part of the page interpreted with the first set of security settings, wherein a second action that is similar to the first action is requested in the content in the at least one other part of the page interpreted with the second set of security settings, and wherein controlling page output and any actions comprises,



allowing the first action and disallowing the second action (column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 5**, Fletcher teaches wherein the first action corresponds to a command to run a first set of script, and wherein the second action corresponds to a command to run a second set of script (Summary of the invention, column 3, lines 40-67).

**Regarding claim 6**, Fletcher teaches wherein the first action corresponds to a command to download a first set of data, and wherein the second action corresponds to a command to download a second set of data (Summary of the invention, column 4, lines 1-67).

**Regarding claim 9**, Fletcher teaches wherein a first action is requested in the content in the at least one part of the page interpreted with the first set of security settings, wherein a second action that is similar to the first action is requested in the content in the at least one other part of the page interpreted with the second set of security settings, and wherein controlling page output and any actions comprises, disallowing the first action and allowing the second action (column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 10**, Fletcher teaches wherein interpreting at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings comprises, retrieving the first set of security settings based on the identifier, and associating the first set of security settings with the at least one part of the page (column 5, lines 1-50).

**Regarding claim 12**, Fletcher teaches wherein the interpreting at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security settings comprises, recognizing security data associated with the element, and associating the second set of security settings with the at least one other part of the page based on the security data (column 6, lines 1-50).

**Regarding claim 17**, Fletcher teaches wherein controlling page output and any actions further comprises, accessing privacy settings (column 4, lines 1-48).

**Regarding claim 18**, Fletcher teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable-instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (abstract).

**Regarding claim 56**, Fletcher teaches wherein the first set of content corresponds to a page, the second set of content is included in the page, and wherein the second set of security settings take precedence over the first set of security settings with respect to determining security for the second set of content (columns 5-6).

**Regarding claim 60**, Fletcher teaches wherein the markup language document includes a reference to a file that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings (columns 5-6).

**Regarding claim 61**, Fletcher teaches wherein the markup language document includes a reference to a source of remote data that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings (column 6, lines 1-50).

**Regarding claim 62**, Fletcher teaches wherein the markup language document includes a string of data that corresponds to at least some of the second set of security settings (column 6, lines 1-50).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

**18. Claims 7-8, 11, 13-14, 16, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher.**

**Regarding claims 7 and 8,** Fletcher does not expressly disclose prompting a user for a response. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that prompting a user for a response was conventional and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prompt a user for a response since Examiner takes Official Notice that it was conventional and well known.

**Regarding claims 11 and 13,** Fletcher does not expressly disclose constructing a tree to represent the page. However, Fletcher teaches parsing the document and wherein associating the settings with the at least one part / other part of the page includes storing data corresponding to the security settings / second set of security settings at a node in the structure that corresponds to the element (tags, columns 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to store a tree as a representation of the document, since a tree is just a representation used for parsing the document.

**Regarding claim 14,** Fletcher teaches wherein storing data corresponding to the second set of security settings comprises negotiating the second set of settings (column 5, lines 55-67, column 6, lines 1-33).

**Regarding claim 16**, Fletcher does not expressly disclose least one setting in the second set of security settings based on security information associated with a child node in the tree. However, Fletcher teaches associating settings with nodes (columns 5-6).

**Regarding claim 57**, Fletcher does not expressly disclose a frame element. However, Fletcher teaches associating security settings to nodes/tags (columns 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings to a specific element.

**19. Claims 15 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher, and further in view of Edwards (NPL "The guide to Internet Security Zones").**

**Regarding claim 15**, Fletcher does not expressly disclose inheritance. However, Edwards teaches wherein negotiating the second set of settings comprises inheriting at least one setting in the second set based on security information associated with a parent node in the tree (pages 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Edwards to the system of Fletcher. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to further protect the system of Fletcher.

**Regarding claim 63**, Fletcher does not expressly disclose inheritance. However, Edwards teaches wherein the markup language document includes information indicating that at least some of the second set of security settings should be determined relative to other security settings (pages 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2136

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Edwards to the system of Fletcher. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to further protect the system of Fletcher.

**20. Claims 26-30 and 32-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher, and further in view of Snell (NPL "SAMS teach yourself the internet in 24 hrs").**

**Regarding claim 26, Fletcher teaches**

- in a computer connected to a network, a system comprising:
- browser software that interprets content received from the network (column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13), and
- a security mechanism that associates a first security level with a first part of the content and associates a second security level with a second part of the content, the security mechanism being further operable to associate a first set of security settings with the first part of the content based on the first security level, and associate a second set of security settings with the second part of the content based on the second security level, the second set of security settings being different from the first (column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13), wherein
- the security mechanism associates at least one of the first security level with the first part of the content or the second security level with the second part of the content based on an identifier indicating a source on

the network or the computer from which the first part of the content or the second part of the content is obtained (column 5, lines 1-50).

Fletcher does not expressly disclose using security zones. However, Snell teaches using security zones (pages 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Snell to the system of Fletcher. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to further protect the system of Fletcher.

**Regarding claim 27**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches a negotiator that controls the second set of security settings (Fletcher, fig 3, and discussion).

**Regarding claim 28**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the negotiator controls the second set of security settings relative to the first set of security settings (Fletcher, column 5, lines 42-67).

**Regarding claim 29**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell does not expressly disclose inheritance. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that using inheritance was conventional and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to inherit security settings from a parent in the system of Fletcher and Snell since Examiner takes Official Notice that it was conventional and well known.

**Regarding claim 30**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the indicator indicates a website on the network or a file on the computer (Fletcher, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 32**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the second part of the content corresponds to an element in the content (Fletcher, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 33**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches a component that detects security data associated with the element (Fletcher, fig 3, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 34**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a security zone (Fletcher, fig 3, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13, Snell, pages 1-8).

**Regarding claim 35**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a file (Fletcher, fig 3, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 36**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the security data associated with the element comprises, a reference to a source of remote data (Fletcher, fig 3, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 37**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the security data associated with the element comprises a string of data corresponding to at least some of the security settings (Fletcher, fig 3, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13).

**Regarding claim 38**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the security data associated with the element comprises information indicating that the security settings should be determined relative to other security settings (Fletcher, fig 3, column 6, lines 1-50, claims 1-13, Snell, pages 1-8).

**Regarding claim 39**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches does not expressly disclose a tree of nodes constructed from the content. However, Fletcher teaches parsing the document and nodes associated with one setting and other nodes associated with another setting (tags, columns 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to store a tree as a representation of the document, since a tree is just a representation used for parsing the document.

**Regarding claim 40**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches a negotiator that controls the second set of security settings (Fletcher, fig 3, and discussion).

**Regarding claim 41**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the negotiator evaluates the second set of security settings (Fletcher, fig 3, and discussion).

**Regarding claim 42**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the negotiator changes at least one setting in the second set of security settings based on a rule (Fletcher, fig 3, and discussion, columns 5-6).

**Regarding claim 43**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches at least one other node in the tree that is associated with security settings based on inheriting information from a parent node (Fletcher, fig 3, and discussion).

**Regarding claims 44 and 45**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the parent node comprises the first / second node (Fletcher, fig 3, and discussion).

**Regarding claim 46**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches at least one other node in the tree that is associated with security settings based on security data of a child node (Fletcher, fig 3, and discussion).



**Regarding claim 47**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell does not expressly disclose a frame element. However, Fletcher teaches associating security settings to nodes/tags (columns 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings to a specific element.

**Regarding claim 48**, the combination of Fletcher and Snell teaches wherein the content comprises a HyperText Markup Language page (Snell, pages 1-8, Fletcher, columns 3-4).

***Conclusion***

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David G. Cervetti whose telephone number is (571) 272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00 am - 5:00 pm, off on Wednesday.


23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2136

24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DGC

NASSER MOAZZAMI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

  
3,26,07